

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

REMARKS

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated February 1, 2007 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this reply, claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-23 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 9 and 16 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 1 was objected to because of an informality of a missing word, "method." Claim 1 has been amended to alleviate this objection.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is asserted that the recited claims do not produce a tangible result. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The claims as filed do produce a tangible result, which result has value. The steps involved include comparing and modifying information, two important real world steps in authenticating an approved user, prior to allowance of access or relaying of content. See, for example, Figure 6. These steps are not abstract and are used in authentication of a user prior to relaying of content. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fuh (USPN 6,609,154). It is asserted that the Fuh recites various elements in his patent that anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Fuh does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in the pending claims because Fuh does not use a known pattern of information. Such pattern may be random and only known to the server. Thus, it cannot be easily guessed or copied. Fuh discloses IP

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT

addresses as authentication information. However, such IP addresses are set and may easily be copied and shared between users. In contrast, the present invention as recited in the pending claims allows a higher level of authentication and control by having a string or series of strings of identifiers to distinguish one user from another. Thus, Fuh cannot anticipate or obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-17, 20, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhigang (US Pub. No. US2005/0014489). It is asserted that the Zhigang recites various elements in his patent that anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Zhigang also fails to anticipate and obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to Fuh. In fact, the same deficiencies exist for Zhigang as did for Fuh. Thus, for the reasons set forth above, Zhigang cannot anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and the applications allowed to proceed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhigang in view of Fuh. It is asserted that the Zhigang teaches substantially the same invention as recited in the pending claims but for an HTTP proxy. It is then asserted that Fuh does teach this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present invention as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Zhigang nor Fuh, nor any other art of record, anticipate or obviate the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Each reference lacks the fundamental teaching of the present invention, as recited in the pending claims. Thus, their combination, even if any motivation existed outside of Applicant's own disclosure, still lacks the teaching to obviate the

Attorney Docket No.: CING-131
Appl. Ser. No.: 10/773,555

PATENT


present invention as recited in the pending claims. So for the reasons set forth in the discussion above, the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed to issue.

A THREE (3) month extension of time is hereby requested to enter this amendment. PTO- 2038 form is included with an authorization to charge the one-month extension fee to a credit card. If any other fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1 August 2007


Fariborz Moazzam
Reg. No. 53,339
Cust. No. 39,013

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC
7601 Lewinsville Road, Suite 304
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 442-9480
(703) 991-5978 (fax)